

IMPROVING STUDENTS' SKILL IN WRITING HORTATORY EXPOSITION THROUGH EMPHASIZING GUIDANCE IN PRE-WRITING STAGE

FahrurRozi, SyarifHusin, Sumarni

English Education Study Program, Language and Art Education Department
Teacher Training and Education Faculty of Tanjungpura University, Pontianak
Email: odjhie888@gmail.com

Abstrak:

Permasalahan siswa dalam menulis adalah mereka tidak tahu bagaimana cara menemukan ide dan mengembangkan ide tersebut untuk tulisan mereka dan bagaimana menggunakan pendapat mereka terhadap sebuah ide tersebut. Untuk membantusiswa dalam memecahkan permasalahan tersebut, penulis menggunakan teknik penekanan bimbingan dalam tahap pra-menulis dengan memberikan mereka pertanyaan-pertanyaan terkait dengan teks model yang telah disiapkan untuk membantusiswa menemukan ide untuk tulisan mereka. Untuk membantusiswa menggunakan pendapat mereka sendiri di dalam tulisan mereka, penulis memilih teks berbentuk hortatory exposition. Penelitian ini dilakukan dengan metode pre-experimental desain satu kelompok pretest-posttest yang bertujuan untuk mengetahui apakah penekanan bimbingan yang menggunakan pertanyaan 5WH dapat meningkatkan kemampuan siswa kelas sebelas di SMA Negeri 6 tahun akademik 2012/2013 dalam menulis teks berbentuk hortatory exposition. Kelas yang dipilih oleh penulis adalah kelas IPA A yang terdiri dari 27 siswa. Teknik pengumpulan data yang digunakan adalah pengukuran alat yang digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data adalah test tertulis. Penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa penekanan bimbingan dengan menggunakan 5WH dalam tahap pra-menulis efektif dalam meningkatkan kemampuan siswa dalam menulis teks berbentuk hortatory exposition. Hasil dari analisis data menunjukkan peningkatan yang signifikan sebesar 21.85 dengan nilai rata-rata pretest yaitu 55.19 yang tergolong dalam kriteria nilai rata-rata dan nilai rata-rata posttest yaitu 77.05 yang tergolong dalam kriteria nilai baik. Efek pengukuran dari perlakuan menunjukkan bahwa penekanan bimbingan dengan menggunakan pertanyaan 5WH dalam tahap pra-menulis sangat efektif dalam meningkatkan kemampuan siswa dalam menulis teks berbentuk hortatory exposition.

Kata Kunci: Penekanan Bimbingan Pada Tahap Pra-Menulis, Teks Berbentuk Hortatory Exposition

Abstract: Most of students' problems in writing are that they do not know how to generate and develop the idea for their writing and how to express their opinion of an idea. To help the students to overcome their problems, the writer used emphasizing guidance technique in prewriting stage by giving the students 5WH questions provided by the writer to help the students to generate the idea for their writing. To help them to use their own opinion of an idea in their writing, the writer chose hortatory exposition text. This research was conducted in a pre-experimental one group pretest-posttest design and purposed to investigate whether the emphasis of guidance by using 5WH questions can improve students' skill in writing hortatory exposition text to eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 6 Pontianak in academic year 2012/2013. The class which was taken by the writer was science class A which consists of 27 students. The technique of data collecting was measurement and the tool of data collecting was written test. It was found that emphasizing guidance by using 5WH in prewriting stage is effective in improving students' skill in writing hortatory exposition text. The result of data analysis showed significant improvement of 21.85 with mean score of pretest 55.19 which is qualified as average and mean score of posttest 77.05 which is qualified as good. The effect size of the treatment (1.91) is more than 0.8 and categorized as high. The effect size of treatment shows that emphasizing guidance by using 5WH questions in prewriting stage is highly effective in improving students' skill in writing hortatory exposition text.

Keywords: Emphasizing Guidance in Pre-Writing stage, Hortatory Exposition Text

English has four skills which are divided into receptive skill and productive skill. Receptive skills consist of reading and listening which are used to interpret the message from written and spoken text. Productive skills consist of writing and speaking and are used to produce a message through speech or written text. In English teaching and learning, those four skills need to be acquired well in order to understand knowledge. In English language teaching, the acquirement of the skills can use different techniques and methods. For the students to learn and acquire the skills, the teacher can use many different techniques and methods. In this research, writer focused on improving students' writing skill by using guidance in prewriting stage.

Writing as one of productive skills, is a process of expressing thought in written format. It relies on many of the same structures as speech, such as vocabulary, grammar, and semantics, with the added dependency of a system of signs and symbols. It is a complex and demanding activities and needs an understanding of the components of a quality test as well as knowledge of writing strategies that can be used to shape and organize the writing process. In writing, there are stages in the process of writing. The stages in writing are prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing. Prewriting is the stage where students plan and gather the idea. In drafting, they use the idea they have from prewriting. Revising is the stage where the students improve their draft. Editing is the stage where the students correct their mechanical error.

In English language teaching and learning in SMAN 6, the problems faced by students in writing are they do not know how to generate idea for their writing, how to develop the idea, and how to express their opinion of an idea. Generating idea from a topic is hard for students to do. They tend to copy a statement or a sentence rather than to develop an idea on their own. In developing the idea, the students seem to have lack of information and/or they do not know where to put the sentence and they often write a new paragraph from a sentence that is supposed to be a supporting detail for a main idea in the paragraph. When they hardly write a good paragraph, putting their own idea and collaborate it with the idea from a paragraph is impossible.

As the problems found by the writer, the writer decided to use guidance in prewriting stage in order to help students to improve their skill in writing. The term of guidance in this research means the act of directing students to generate ideas by using provided questions and to develop the ideas into paragraphs. To improve students' skill in writing, the writer chose hortatory exposition text which is considered proper text to help students to overcome their problems in writing. Hortatory exposition text is a type of written text that is intended to explain the readers that something should or should not happen or be done. It is chosen by the writer to use as the medium to transform students' idea into written form because hortatory exposition text is a text that can invite the students to argue about a topic and this is hoped to overcome their problem in putting their idea into the text.

METHOD

In order to investigate the effectiveness of emphasizing guidance in pre-writing stage in improving students' skill in writing hortatory exposition text, this study involves a pre-experimental research one group pretest-posttest design, a design that eliminates all factors that influence outcome except for the cause being studied (independent variable). All other factors are controlled by randomization, investigator controlled manipulation of independent variable, and control of the study situation by investigator. This pre-experimental design does not involve control group. The subject is chosen from students in existing classes in order not to disrupt the school routine. The one group pretest-posttest design can be represented as O1, X, and O2. O1 represents pretest used to ascertain level of students' understanding before treatment. O2 represents posttest given to test the level of students' understanding after the treatment and X represents treatment by emphasizing guidance in pre-writing.

The population in this research is the eleventh grade of SMAN 6 academic year 2012/2013 which consists of five classes; XI Social class A, B, and C and XI Science class A and B. The sample of this research was taken by using convenience sampling which one sampling in non-probability sampling. Cohen (2005; p.99) says that in a non-probability sampling or purposive sampling, the chances of the wider population being selected for the sample is unknown, some members of the wider population will be excluded and others definitely included. . In this sampling, the researcher deliberately-purposely-selected a particular section of the wider population to include in or exclude from the sample. A non-probability sample deliberately avoids representing the wider

population; it seeks only to represent a particular group, e.g. a class of students, a group of students who are taking examination, a group of teacher. This research employed convenience sampling and chose XI Science Class 1 which consists of 27 students as the sample because the class was accessible to the writer.

The measurement technique was applied in collecting students' data to know the effectiveness of emphasizing guidance in pre-writing stage in improving students' skill in writing hortatory exposition text. The measurement was conducted twice; pretest and posttest. The pretest was given before the treatment and the posttest was given after the treatment. The tool of data collecting was written test. The criteria to score were the content and the mechanic. The interval score of the mean score of posttest and pretest was used to find the significance of students' score. The significance of students' score was used in the analysis on the effect size of treatment. The classification of the effect size and the interpretation of pretest and posttest score are categorized as follow:

Table 1 Classifications of Effect Size

Low	$ES \leq 0.2$
Moderate	$2 < ES < 0.8$
High	$ES > 0.8$

Table 2 Interpretation of Pretest and Posttest Score

Good to Excellent	80-100
Average to Good	60-79
Poor to Average	50-59
Poor	0-49

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

A. FINDING

This research was conducted to get accurate data about the effectiveness of emphasizing guidance in prewriting stage in improving students' skill in writing hortatory exposition text. The effectiveness of the guidance in prewriting stage is measured from text organization and language features.

This research was conducted in SMAN 6 Pontianak academic year 2012/2013. The writer took XI Science Class A as the sample of research by using convenience sampling and the class consists of 27 students. The measurement was conducted twice; pretest and posttest. Students' skill in writing hortatory exposition text was assessed through written test in both pretest and posttest. After the students' score of pretest and posttest were obtained, the mean score was measured for both pretest and posttest. After the analysis on students' mean score of pretest and posttest, the interval score

between both tests by measuring the difference score of posttest to pretest. In order to get the result of the effect size of the treatment, the analysis on the test significance was measured by employing sum of squared deviation which then used in test significance.

Students' mean score of pretest and posttest, interval score, test significance, and the effect size of treatment will be shown in the Table 1 below:

Table 3 Summary of Students' Score Analysis

Mean Score of Pretest	Mean Score of Posttest	Interval Score	Test Significance	Effect Size
55.19	77.04	21.85	9.98	1.91

Based on the classification of the effect size, it was found that emphasizing guidance in pre-writing stage is effective in teaching hortatory exposition text.

B. DISCUSSION

In this research, the writer emphasized guidance in prewriting stage in teaching hortatory exposition text. The emphasis of the guidance enabled the students to regenerate and develop ideas from the model text before they start writing. The emphasis of the guidance was in form of 5WH questions that have been prepared by the writer.

The first data was collected by administering pretest to obtain precondition short hortatory exposition text before treated by emphasizing guidance. The pretest was held to obtain precondition in short hortatory exposition text before treated by emphasizing guidance. Each student had to write a hortatory exposition text about television. They were asked to pay attention on their text organization, and mechanic in writing hortatory exposition text. The mean score was 55.19 which is categorized lower than minimum criteria on standard score or categorized as poor.

After the first data was obtained, the writer started the treatment by emphasizing the guidance in prewriting stage. The treatment was held in two meetings. In the first treatment, teacher started by explaining a hortatory exposition generic structure and features. Teacher used a text sample of hortatory exposition about television and explained through each paragraph. Every paragraph which represents generic structure of hortatory exposition text is explained by showing the idea of each paragraph and the supporting sentence(s) uses to explain the idea. After explaining the text, the teacher started questioning students about hortatory exposition text explained. Teacher then explain about the hortatory exposition one more time in short to help them recall about the structure of hortatory exposition text.

After giving a short explanation about hortatory exposition, teacher started introduce the students about stages in writing which consist of prewriting stage, drafting stage, revising stage, and editing stage. Every stage was explained in detail. After explaining the stages in writing, the teacher explained about the guidance in prewriting stage. Teacher explained about the

guidance in helping students to regenerate ideas from text. The guidance was in for of questions. After the explanation, students started practicing to use guidance to regenerate ideas from the text. After that, they had to arrange every idea in order. After they had the ideas, the students then started to write their draft. Teacher re-explained about how to write a draft while students were ongoing process of drafting. When they already finished with their draft, then the teacher asked them to start revising and so the students checked whether they used the same sentence in different paragraph. In editing stage, the students checked for their grammatical error and teacher helped them for it.

In the second treatment, teacher started the class by questioning about hortatory exposition, its generic structure and features, stages of writing, and questioning about the steps of guidance in prewriting stage. After that, teacher re-explained about hortatory exposition, its generic structure and features, writing stages, and the guidance in prewriting stage. After the brainstorming, the teacher repeated the drill of regenerating ideas by using the guidance the students started all over again by answering questions, drafting, revising, and editing.

After the treatment was done, the writer administered the posttest to obtain the final data to be compared with the first data in order to know whether there was a difference of the posttest and the pretest after the treatment. The posttest score of 77.04 showed a significant difference of 21.85 with the pretest of 55.19. This difference showed a significant improvement of students' skill in writing hortatory exposition text.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

A. Conclusion

Referring to the research findings and the analysis of students' test result, the writer states the conclusion as: (1) Teaching hortatory exposition text by emphasizing guidance in prewriting is effective and proved by students' score. (2) Emphasizing guidance in prewriting stage is effectively improves students' skill in writing hortatory exposition text. This technique helps students actively to collect information and to gather the ideas before they start writing. The effectiveness of emphasizing guidance is showed by the mean score of the posttest which is 21.85 higher than pretest mean score. The mean score of posttest result (77.04) was classified "good" and the pretest result (55.19) was classified "average" and the effect size (1.91) was classified as "high".

B. Suggestion

In order to improve the effectiveness of the guidance in prewriting stage, the suggestion that is stated by the writer as: (1) The questions should be prepared well which will enable students to find the information they need to start their writing. (2) The example of the text should be prepared properly and explained through answering questions, arranging the idea, and developing the idea. (3) Students should be attracted to participate in the task of writing hortatory exposition by providing a model text which will invite their personal opinion to argue with their own words. (4) The time should be

managed well in order to have the students go through all stages of writing practice and the emphasis of the guidance should be clear in prewriting stage.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amarain S., Anakia, & Lapae K. 2009. *Text Forms and Features*. Umbrella Corporation.
- Arikunto, S. 2006. *Prosedur Penelitian (6th Ed)*. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.
- Bailey, S. 2003. *Academic Writing*, New York: Nelson Thornes Ltd.
- Bausel, RB. & Li Y.F. 2002. *Power Analysis for Experimental Research*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, H. D. 2000. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching (4th Ed.)*. New York: Longman.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. 2000. *Research Method in Education (5th Ed.)*. New York: Routledge Farmer.
- Coffin, C., Curry, M.J., Goodman, S., Hewings, A., Lillis, M., & Swann, J. 2003. *Teaching Academic Writing*. New York: Routledge.
- Elbow, P. 1998. *Writing with Power*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fulcher, G. & Davidson, F. 2007. *Language Testing and Assessment*. New York; Routledge.
- Greenville, Kate. 2001. *Writing from Start to Finish*. South Australia: Griffin Press.
- Heaton, J. B. 1990. *Writing English Language Tests*. New York: Longman.
- Hatch, E., & Farhady, H. 1990. *The Research Manual Design and Statistic for Applied Linguistics*. New York: Newbury House Publisher.
- Juan, E. U., & Flor, A. M. (Eds.). 2006. *Current Trends in The Development and Teaching of The Four Language Skills*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH.
- Kane, T.S. 2000. *The Oxford Essential Guide to Writing*. New York: The Berkley Publishing Group.
- Kaplan. 2006. *Writing Source: The Smarter Way to Learn How to Write*. New York: Kaplan Inc.
- Kaplan. 2008. *Sharp Writing: Building Better Writing Skills*. New York: Kaplan Inc.

- Kaufman, A.S. & Kaufman N.L. (Ed). 2005. *Essentials of Research Design and Methodology*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. 2006. *Writing Academic English (4th Ed.)*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Raimes, Ann. 1983. *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ross, K. (Ed). 2005. *Educational Research: some basic concepts and terminology*. UNESCO
- Urquhart, V., & McIver, M. 2005. *Teaching Writing in The Content Areas*. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.